

Response
USSN 10/624,474
Art Unit 3725

5

REMARKS

Claim amendments:

Claims 1-3 are cancelled.

Claim 4 is amended to include limitations from claims 5-7, additional limitations concerning the configuration of gate and ramp, supported for example by paragraphs 24-26 and Figs. 3, 5 and 5A of the present disclosure and a restriction to mobile vehicle mounted paper shredders.

Claims 5-7 are cancelled, and claims 8-13 have consequential amendments.

Claim 14 is amended to include limitations from paragraph 23 of the disclosure.

Claims 15 and 16 are cancelled to facilitate prosecution.

Claims 16 and 17 are amended to include limitations from paragraph 23 of the disclosure.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of either deVries or Uno. Response: Claims 1-3 are cancelled, rendering that rejection moot. Claim 14 has been amended to refer to the subject matter of paragraph 23 of the description, and is submitted to be patentable. New claims 17 and 18 are likewise submitted to be patentable as depending on claim 14.

Claim 14 requires "the fire suppression liquid being sprayed at a liquid feed rate between 0 and 5 gallons per minute that removes dust particles from the air". The

Response
USPN 10/624,474
Art Unit 3725

6

practical advantages of this limitation are (1) dust reduction reduces fire hazard, and (2) the amount of liquid that removes the dust particles from the air also helps compact the paper for easier disposal.

deVries teaches a particular droplet size for use in treating municipal solid waste that may contain flammable materials. The droplet size is intended to avoid absorption on surfaces (col. 3, lines 15-36). While some dust removal does occur (col. 6, lines 23-27), the removal is incidental and the intention seems to be to maximize the survival rate of the water droplets throughout the equipment (see claim 1 of deVries). The intended fire suppression mechanism is by quenching, rather than removal of dust (for example, col. 5, lines 45-49). Hence, deVries approaches a different problem (flammability of municipal waste during milling) and proposes a different solution (enhanced survival of quenching droplets).

Because deVries approaches a different problem, namely flammable materials in municipal waste, such as gasoline (col. 1, line 28), it is submitted that it is not relevant to the problem of fire hazard reduction in mobile paper shredders. It is submitted that mobile paper shredders are a completely separate art. Moreover, the combination of deVries and APA does not yield the invention since deVries teaches survival of the fine water mist, while the present invention removes dust from the air with the water spray. Since deVries teaches a different approach, the invention as claimed in claim 14 cannot be obvious in view of APA and deVries.

Uno is also irrelevant because Uno deals with a different problem from fire hazard reduction in mobile paper shredders. Like deVries, Uno deals with explosive materials in garbage disposal. Further, Uno proposes a different solution, namely steam used to reduce oxygen content inside a crusher. Uno does not teach use of liquid, removal of dust as a fire suppression technique, or treatment of shredded paper. It is not obvious to look to Uno, or the municipal waste art in general, for useful solution, and further,

Response
USPN 10/624,474
Art Unit 3725

7

combination of Uno with APA does not yield or suggest the invention. Uno has a very narrow focus far removed from the present invention.

One of the difficulties with using the proposals of Uno and deVries as references against the present invention is that they do not teach improvements to the mobile paper shredding art. It is submitted that one cannot conclude from successful use of a mist in deVries to reduce fire hazard from gasoline, or steam in Uno to eliminate oxygen as an explosion promoter, that supplying a water spray to the interior of a mobile paper shredder would work to reduce fire hazard without some other problem arising, such as the paper shredding implements being jammed. Hence, it is submitted that the references are not relevant, and the invention as defined by claim 14, and hence also 16 and 17, is patentable.

Claims 4-7, 9-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of either Garnier or Robertson. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 4 distinguishes Garnier and Robertson by requiring a mobile paper shredder mounted on a vehicle, the opening for paper entering the feed compartment being above the feed compartment, and the gate and ramp sloping towards each other (forming a V-shape). None of the references teach the configuration in which the opening is above the feed compartment, and the gate extends downwards towards a ramp, which itself slopes downwards towards the paper shredding implements. Hence, when paper is supplied to the mobile paper shredder, it initially falls downward onto the gate, where it is held until supplied to the paper shredding implements. The obvious approach from Garnier might be to use a ram 38 (Fig. 1) or from Robertson to use a conveyor rather than dropping paper from the top of the container onto a V-shaped surface, one side of which is removable to meter paper into the paper shredding implements. Garnier's nor Robertson's solutions are more

Response
USSN 10/624,474
Att Unit 3725

8

complicated, requiring a ram or conveyor, and thus less suitable for use in a mobile paper shredder mounted on a vehicle, due to the limited space, and in any event neither teaches the proposed solution. The applicant's solution is an elegant solution to dust reduction (by containment of dust within the paper shredding compartment) and paper supply metering in the space limited environment of a mobile paper shredding vehicle.

It is submitted that claims 9-11 are patentable for like reason as claim 4.


The limitations of claims 12 and 13 are not discussed by the examiner and should be patentable.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of either Garnier or Robertson and further in view of Uno or deVries. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the reasons set out above in relation to claim 4 and further on the ground that neither Uno nor deVries deal with mobile vehicle mounted paper shredders.

Respectfully submitted and signed on

Mar. 14/06

(Date)


ANTHONY R. LAMBERT
Registration No. 32,813
Customer no. 020212
Telephone: (780) 448-7326

AGENT OF RECORD